Subject: Re: Encampment in alley issue

From: Kurt Knecht

Date: 10/30/2016 06:08 PM

To: Blair Besten

CC: Sean Lewis <slo.41.lewis@gmail.com>, Kurt Knecht <kurt.knecht@lacity.org>, Sean Lewis <34717@lapd.lacity.org>

56.11 applies to "streets" which it defines broadly to include sidewalks and alleys.

This means that encampments in alleys have to follow the same 72 hour notice provisions as sidewalks. But 56.11(g) provides an exception if the personal property provides an immediate threat to the health and safety of the public.

Based on 56.11(g), encampments in roadways whether they be streets or alleys could be moved if it can be determined that they are a danger to the health and safety of the public. The danger of being run over certainly seems like it would qualify.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2016, at 5:41 PM, Blair Besten < blair@historiccore.bid > wrote:

Thanks. I don't think my original message went through but I really don't understand how a thoroughfare for vehicular traffic would be governed by the same law as a sidewalk, which is intended for pedestrian traffic. ? One is inherently more dangerous-not to mention the failure of 56.11 to work under current litigation and perceived constraints? It's like setting up ourselves to fail. And this should be about people not stuff.

I know moving encampments is a hot issue, but allowing people to establish themselves sets up others passing through and committing 41.18 to be in grave danger. Like I said - we have been here before and the worst case scenario is devastating. Alleys are dark even by day and many parking garages and loading should be given the only acceptable pass to maneuver in such a place.

Help me understand what you mean.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2016, at 9:45 AM, Kurt Knecht < fiscales.kurt@gmail.com > wrote:

Thank you Sean. I know this part of the job is most challenging as you balance the respective needs of the community.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2016, at 9:38 AM, Sean Lewis < slo.41.lewis@gmail.com > wrote:

FYI, I did a walk through, the encampment is now gone :)

On Oct 29, 2016 11:27 PM, "Kurt Knecht" < kurt.knecht@lacity.org> wrote:

Blair and Sean,

With regards encampments in alleys, if we can establish that it is open for traffic, then I think 56.11(g) would be an effective enforcement section.

56.11(g) No Person shall Store any Personal Property in a Public Area if the Personal Property, whether Attended or Unattended, constitutes an immediate threat to the health or safety of the public. Without prior notice, the City may remove and may discard any Personal Property Stored in a Public Area if the Personal Property poses an immediate threat to the health or safety of the public.

__

Kurt Knecht

Deputy City Attorney

Neighborhood Prosecutor

Safe Neighborhoods and Gang Division

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office

Kurt.Knecht@lacity.org

213.978.8022 (o)

310.625.4235(c)

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney, which may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the

original message and any attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney, which may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,

distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachments without reading or saving in any manner.
